

Application No.: 10/782,574

Docket No.: JCLA12196-R

REMARKS**Present Status of the Application**

Claims 1-14 are pending of which claims 1 and 10 have been amended and claims 8 and 12 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Amendments to claims 1 and 10 are fully supported by FIG. 12. Therefore, it is believed that no new matter adds by way of amendments to claims 1 and 10, or otherwise to the application. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action dated August 18, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1-7, 10, 11, 13, 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ramanujan et al. (US-2002/0118375, hereinafter Ramanujan); rejected claims 8, 9 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramanujan in view of Hansen et al. (US-6,666,556, hereinafter Hansen).

Applicants respectfully submit that at least for the following reasons claims 1-7, 9-11, 13, 14 and 15 patentably define over prior arts of record. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Discussion of the claim rejections under 35 USC 102 & 35 USC 103

1. *The Office Action rejected claims 1-7, 10, 11, 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ramanujan et al. (US-2002/0118375, hereinafter Ramanujan).*
2. *The Office Action rejected claims 8, 9, 12 and 15 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramanujan in view of Hansen et al. (US-6,666,556, hereinafter Hansen).*

Application No.: 10/782,574

Docket No.: JCLA12196-R

In rejecting the above claims, the Examiner states that Ramanujan teaches all the elements of the claimed invention except for the presence of the polarizer disposed in the light path of each of the first, second and third light beams. However, the Examiner relied upon Hansen stating that Hansen discloses pre-polarizers 16a-c to further direct the light to the remaining components in the system, including an arrangement of WGP. The color image projection systems of Ramanujan and Hansen are analogous. It would have been obvious to include the additional prepolarizer as taught by Hansen to further direct the light to components including an array of WGP as taught by Hansen.

Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the above rejections as follows. Applicants respectfully submit that the light beams polarized by the pre-polarizers 16a-c of Hansen, as shown in FIG. 1a, directly pass or transmit through the respective WGP 14a-c and the WGP 14a-c DO NOT REFLECT the light beams polarized by the pre-polarizers 16a-c. Therefore, it is clear that Hansen substantially fails to teach, suggest or disclose at least [a first polarizer, a second polarizer and a third polarizer, respectively disposed in a light path of each of the first, second and third light beams such that the first, second and third light beams polarized and are respectively incident to the first, second and third WGP and are respectively reflected by the first, second and third WGP to the first, second and third liquid reflection panels], as specified by the amended proposed independent claim 1, instead, Hansen substantially teaches that the light beams polarized by the pre-polarizers 16a-c are NOT reflected by the WGP 14a-c to the

Application No.: 10/782,574

Docket No.: JCLA12196-R

respective liquid crystal panels. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of teachings of Ramanujan and Hansen, in a manner suggested by the Examiner, cannot possibly meet the claimed invention as claimed in the amended proposed claim 1 in this regard.

Furthermore, because the amended proposed independent Claim 10, which is directed to an optical projection method, also recites features similar to the amended proposed independent Claim 1, therefore Claim 10 also patentably define over Ramanujan for at least the same reasons discussed above.

Claims 2-7 and 9, and 11, 13 and 14, which directly or indirectly depend from amended proposed independent Claims 1 and 10 respectively, are also patentable over Ramanujan, at least because of their dependency from an allowable base claim.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claims 1-7, 9, 10, 11, 13 and 14 patentably define over Ramanujan. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Application No.: 10/782,574

Docket No.: JCLA12196-R


CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that all the pending claims 1-7, 9-11 and 13-15 of the present application patently define over the prior art and are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Date: 3/28/2006

4 Venture, Suite 250
Irvine, CA 92618
Tel.: (949) 660-0761
Fax: (949)-660-0809

Respectfully submitted,
J.C. PATENTS



Jiawei Huang
Registration No. 43,330